

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final Office Action dated June 2, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claims 1, 7, 8 and 12 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0163615, issued to Fujioka et al. (hereafter “Fujioka”), in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0131003, issued to Matsumoto (hereafter “Matsumoto”), and U.S. Patent No. 5,737,051, issued to Kondo et al. (hereafter “Kondo”). Applicant traverses the rejection because neither Fujioka, Matsumoto nor Kondo, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Fujioka, Matsumoto and Kondo fail to teach or suggest an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device that includes, among other features, “a sealant in the sealant region attaching the first and second substrates, wherein the sealant is located over the gate and data pads” as recited in amended, independent claim 1 of the present application. Because neither Fujioka, Matsumoto nor Kondo teach at least this feature of independent claim 1, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-7 are allowable over any combination of Fujioka, Matsumoto and Kondo.

Applicant further traverses the rejection because neither Fujioka, Matsumoto nor Kondo teach or suggest a method for fabricating an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device that includes, among other features, “forming a sealant over the gate and data pads of the sealant region” as recited in amended, independent claim 8 of the present application. Because neither Fujioka, Matsumoto nor Kondo teach at least this feature of independent claim 8, claim 8 and its dependent claims 9-13 are allowable over any combination of Fujioka, Matsumoto and Kondo.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-13 are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujioka and Kondo in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,407,783, issued to Ohgawara et al. (hereafter “Ohgawara”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because neither Fujioka, Kondo nor Ohgawara, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Fujioka, Kondo and Ohgawara fail to teach or suggest an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device “wherein the sealant is located over the gate and data pads” as recited in independent claim 1, and “forming a sealant over the gate and data pads of the sealant region” as recited in independent claim 8.

The Office Action concedes Fujjoka and Kondo fail to teach “the black matrix extends over at least one thin film transistor in the array region” as recited in claims 14 and 15 of the present application. To remedy this deficient teaching of Fujioka and Kondo, the Office Action relies upon the teachings of Ohgawara. However, Applicant respectfully submits Ohgawara fails to remedy the deficient teachings of Fujioka and Kondo such that any combination of the teachings of Fujioka, Kondo and Ohgawara would provide a device and method having the combined features recited in independent claims 1 and 8 of the present application.

By virtue of their dependence from independent claims 1 and 8, claims 14 and 15, respectively, contain the above allowable features of claims 1 and 8. Because no combination of Fujioka, Kondo and Ohgawara teaches the combined features of the present application, claim 1 and its dependent claim 14, and claim 8 and its dependent claim 15 are allowable over Fujioka, Kondo and Ohgawara. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14 and 15 are respectfully requested.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

The undersigned hereby signs this filing under the authority provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.34 pending the filing of a Power of Attorney and Statement under 3.73(b) executed by the Assignee.

Dated: August 31, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant